commission on the ORGANIZATION of the government FOR the conduct of FOREIGN POLICY



June, 1975

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price \$2.75
Stock Number 022-000-00108-6

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

2025 M STREET, N.W WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506 June 27, 1975

TO: The President The President pro tempore of the Senate The Speaker of the House of Representatives

On behalf of my colleagues and myself I submit herewith the Report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy.

The Commission was established by Public Law 92-352 to submit findings and recommendations in order to provide a more effective system for the formulation and implementation of the nation's foreign policy. A copy of the law is annexed to the Report.

The findings and recommendations of the Commission are presented in a single volume with a Summary at the beginning. These findings and recommendations are those of the members of the Commission. Supplementary views of individual Commissioners are attached to the Report. The detailed research and analysis of scholars and experienced practitioners which were developed in the course of the Commission's work are set forth in seven volumes of appendices. These studies should provide a solid base for further study.

We believe that the report will be of value in considering future changes in the organization of the government for the conduct of foreign policy.

We acknowledge gratefully the genuine cooperation the Commission has received from the many agencies of government, and individuals, from whom it has sought information and counsel.

The members of the Commission deem it an honor and a pleasure to have had the opportunity to serve in this challenging and important task.

Respectfully,

Rowers & hearpen Robert D. Murphy

Chairman

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

ROBERT D. MURPHY, Chairman Honorary Chairman, Corning Glass International

DAVID M. ABSHIRE Chairman, Center of Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University

Anne Armstrong** Counsel to the President, The White House

WILLIAM J. CASEY President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of U.S.

Mrs. Charles E. Engelhard, Jr. The Engelhard Company

Arend D. Lubbers President, Grand Valley State College, Allendale, Michi-

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

JAMES B. PEARSON, Vice ChairmanUnited States Senate

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD* U.S. House of Representatives

Frank C. P. McGlinn Executive Vice President, Fidelity Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.

MIKE MANSFIELD United States Senate

STANLEY P. WAGNER President, East Central University, Ada, Oklahoma

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI U.S. House of Representatives

Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen*** U.S. House of Representatives U.S. House of Representatives

✓ Nelson A. Rockefeller

The Vice President

*** Resigned January 1975; succeeded by William S. Broomfield, March 1975.

^{*} Resigned December 1973; succeeded by Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, January 1974.

^{**} Resigned November 1974; succeeded by Nelson A. Rockefeller, December 1974.

supervising the production of

suseful, but the major institution NSCIC, has not functioned adecorrect this situation. There was ithin the Commission about how SCIC. Some favored making the ident's principal intelligence adority and the incentive to bring gular basis, as well as an intimate intelligence community. Others tional Security Adviser as Chairpresentative of the President on o an important intelligence user, uacy and timeliness of the intelligence

used as the principal forum for dent, of the differing perspectives ducers, and should meet frequently

s. To meet the needs of decisionaddress the key questions; it must ytic competence and integrity. To Commission makes recommenda-

olves the more effective utilization Foreign Service reporting. A series the focus and improving the qualppear in Chapter 9.

nomic intelligence. As the economic it is crucial that accurate and fard and supply problems, emerging at opportunities, and international of foreign policy decision-makers. In the frequently requires enormous ost economic issues do not depend to their understanding lies in highly ocurable data. Commendably, CIA fility for economic analysis in recent—this is not a field in which CIA, or ally, has a strong comparative advanton in large-scale data-gathering is

expensive and wasteful, competition in analysis is relatively cheap and highly desirable. We recommend, therefore, that

while the intelligence agencies should retain and exercise their improved competence in the analysis of international economic issues, the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture, and the Council of Economic Advisors must maintain similar capabilities focused on the analysis of issues involving their own responsibilities. We believe that, in all four of the Departments, those capabilities should be significantly strengthened.

Thirdly, we propose a modification to the NIO system. Prior to 1973, National Intelligence Estimates (NIEs), the formal expressions of the intelligence community's best judgment on major issues, were produced by a Board of National Estimates. But that collegial process tended to produce better estimates of what the community could agree upon than what policymakers needed to know. The Board has been replaced by some eleven individual National Intelligence Officers (NIOs), each charged with insuring the responsiveness of NIEs to policy needs in particular substantive areas. NIEs are now drafted by individual experts selected by the NIO from various intelligence agencies. Predictably, the gains in responsiveness of estimates have been somewhat offset by problems of reliability, and the practice of requiring officers already bearing other responsibilities to undertake the production of NIEs has created unnecessary burdens. Most important, NIEs appear to have little impact on policymakers today, in large part because key consumers prefer to base their own estimates of future developments on competing sources of information and analysis. NIEs have lately begun to reflect more clearly differences in view within the intelligence community, but we believe that this process should be intensified. For these reasons we propose that

a small staff of the highest quality, drawn from within and without the intelligence community and responsible for the drafting and review of NIEs, should be established. This staff, reporting directly to the DFI, should be charged with reporting clearly any important differences in the views of concerned agencies, and the reasons for such differences.

Finally, we note that, while investing very large sums in sophisticated technical means of intelligence collection, the community has tended to slight the contribution that only human sources can make. On many subjects, the completeness and accuracy of intelligence estimates depend on factors of intention and motivation that only human sources can provide. We believe that efforts to maintain and utilize such sources should be enlarged and strengthened. These efforts should include improved Foreign Service reporting (elsewhere discussed),

103